From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: bauer@hrz.uni-kassel.de (Stefan Bauer)
Subject: [3363] *** YAESU FT 70 GH *** need help!
Message-ID: <9601251047.AA15129@hrz-ws39.hrz.uni-kassel.de>

Hi Gang....

belive it or not... even germany is picking up on cold winter days...
I love it, having minus 15 celsius!

but anyway......

name here is steve VY1QRP/DL1FDF. qth is central germany 200 km north of kassel.

 **** L O O K I N G for INFO on the YAESU FT 70 GH *****

~~~~~~   need pc-board diagrams block diagram and service manual.......

if you can help please come back to....

==========================================================
         73 de DL 1 FDF  alias  VY 1 QRP
                Steve from Kassel

    Internet     :     bauer@hrz.uni-kassel.de
    Packet Radio :     dl1fdf@db0vfk.#hes.deu.eu
    G-QRP #      :          8769
    qrp-l          :        252
==========================================================

/EoF/

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu  Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: John Mckee <jmckee@rfmd.com>
Subject: [3383] 30 meters
Message-ID: <199601251811.NAA19448@nss2.CC.Lehigh.EDU>

Fellow brass pounders,

Most of my qrp activity on 30 has been between 10.115 and 10.125,
although
I also work the lower part too.  Any frequency between these would make
~~~~~~

a good qrp calling frequency. What do you think? Most of my qrp to qrp contacts were between these frequencies. 10.106 gets crowded, especially during good band conditions.

Here's a question for all you NN1G, SWL-XX rig owners. The gain/attenuation
pot seems to be pretty noisy. Is this inherent to the radio or do I need to
change pot? I thought about trying a conductive plastic pot.

73/72

John McKee WB4OFT
jmckee@rfmd.com

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: adams@chuck.dallas.sgi.com (chuck adams)
Subject: [3362] 40M again
Message-ID: <199601250640.GAA01536@chuck.dallas.sgi.com>

Gang,

Well, when I got home I fired up the Explorer II getting ready for a run at the old fox.

Went off to supper and go back a little after 7pm. So start tuning from the low end of the band to check on conditions. Wow, strong critter at 7.012. Let me get his call. Hey a zero, what the hey, let's see if he can hear me. He's 599 solid and I get a 569 with my puny .95. He's running 1KW!! From SD!! Chat wid him and he says he'll run up to 30M and see if we can connect. Nope, band is dead real dead. Good try. I call him long distance to thank him. Hams are nice aren't they?

Rest of evening spent listening for the fox. Heard Smitty very faintly but no one else.

Later tuning around band and I hear pileup on 7.010MHz. Too big for me. About 0432Z (10:30 local) call CQ on 7.041 and get a 2 in NY. He's QRP and running a NW80/20 from Danny's Small Parts. He's happy to hear Roy is coming out with his own kits. Promise to send him info. He's excited about the new kits from everyone. I'm telling you it is an exciting time.

Later I go back to the low end and I pick up in one
call (braggin here) JG3KIV/6Y5 (Jamaica) with 559 to
his 599 (true). No one around but him and once in a while
another station. Good conditions on 40M. Told you earlier
that I thought this would be a good week.

FYI

dit dit
--
Chuck Adams (K5FO CP-60) adams@sgi.com
Box 181150, Dallas, TX 75218-8150

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: Jeff Gold <JMG@tntech.edu>
Subject: [3370] 6 meter aventure rig
Message-ID: <01I0F5TVQRKI9QZZK6@tntech.edu>

All,

I just started playing with the new MFJ 6 meter SSB travel rig.
This is very similiar to the 20 meter rig that got the great
writeup in QST this month.

I owned the 20 m rig and one of the only rigs I am REALLY sorry I
sold.. if I find one on the market cheap enough, going to buy it
(with CW adapter)

well the new 6 meter rig is in the same box, has a power
indicator, I got mine with the matching mike with works great.
There is a main tuning knob and a fine tuning knob and a volume
control.

this rig has plenty of audio.. I found I can't turn it up more
than a little bit and it sounds great. It has built in speech
processing and puts out 8-10 watts. Couldn't be any easier to
use.

I got mine last Saturday. I took it out of the box, plugged in the
mike and hooked up my antenna. I found a power plug that fit it
(standard Radio Shack) coming from one of my supplies and powered
it up. I first hooked it to my Gap vertical because I remembered
the Gap is suppose to be resonant on 6 meters.. and it sure is.

I tuned the band (think there was a 6 meter contest). Only found

one dude on the air somewhere in Tenn. Talked to him for a while..
got some GREAT comments. I asked about how the voice quality
sounded and he said something like "It sounds great, I hope my
rigs sounds as good to you" .. and he was using one of them
expensive Japanese computers/radios.

I got on the air the other evening to do more extensive testing
with a local who is into 6 meters... I decided to hook up my 160
meter dipole.. found I could tune it.. signals went up something
like 4 s units. Played with the adjustment on the back of the rig
for, I believe, the processor. The person on the other end of the
QSO sounded just like he does everyday when I see him in person,
and he said I was sounded great.

Guess I need to get some type of directional antenna. I noticed I
can tune my Lightning Bolt Quad on 6, but believe the polarity
would be wrong.

72

Jeff, AC4HF

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: rognym@algonet.se (Roger Nyman)
Subject: [3361] Antennas
Message-ID: <199601250733.IAA18241@plato.algonet.se>

MULTIBANDSANTENNAS

 I=B4m looking for a good multibandsantennas for qrp. Do you have any=20
experience of Barker&Williamsson AC 1.8-30 or BWDS 1.8-30???? compared with =
=20
longwires, G5RV, verticals, zeppantennas, W3DZZ or deltaloops.

SM7RYR=09
G-QRP 6036

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: richards@nylink.org
Subject: [3408] ARCI Voting
Message-ID: <9601252330.AA15822@genesis.nylink.org>

Hi All,

Lots of good stuff in the January '96 issue of "The Quarterly". However, the one piece of information I wanted wasn't in there. What is the deadline for mailing in the votes for the ARCI BoD? Can we just mail it in when we feel like it? Do the votes have to be received before the new Board takes over?

72 de Rick WZ2T NNY
richards@nylink.org

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: "LSM" <lsm@dscc.dk>
Subject: [3364] Computer artwork for HB
Message-ID: <9600258225.AA822598046@smtplink.dscc.dk>

Hi gang
I have also had very good results with the use of computer design for homebrew artwork. I have used a laserprinter, so only B/W printouts can be made, but combined with various leves of grey, the results have been very good.

The material I have printed on is selfadhesive vinylfoil, which is capable of taking the heat of the laserprinter (Brand: ScotchMark). It is not cheap, but you can fill it with call-labels, alarm signs etc. to make the most of it. Check the size on paper before the final printout, I have experienced that a HP4 stretched the print abt. 5%, but only in PCL-mode, not PostScript. After printing, a layer of transparent lacquer is applied to protect the surface.

Using Micrografx Draw! I have made front panels for projects like CMOS keyer II, packet TNC's, microwattmeter, transverter switchbox.

If you have (access to) a scanner, new possibilities arise. I have scanned a lousy PCB-artwork from a magazine, given it a touch-up in Paintbrush and printed it out to make a very nicelooking PBC. If you use 300 DPI resolution, you can easily count 30 pixels for the exact 1/10" pin distance of IC's. Remember to select 300 DPI if you use a 600 DPI printer.

For the microwattmeter, I used an instrument with no scale, so I had to make the dBm-scale myself. I scannned the empty scale to get the outline of the scale, measured the needle movement angle, used a spreadsheet to calculate angles for the dBm ticks and MGX Designer to import the scanned scale and enter angles directly to draw the ticks. This way you can also make instruments for SWR-, S-meters etc.

Hope this has given you some ideas about new aspects of Computer Aided Hamming !

73 de Lars, OZ1CJX

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: "Norman E. Fink" <norm@uu1238.flowerslabs.com>
Subject: [3394] Cute Remarks
Message-ID: <9601251949.AA05604@flowerslabs.com>

Two of a kind - WB8JZL and N2CX

What would happen if someone made a real mistake?

My thanks to the other, more considerate member of the list, who notified me directly of the problem so I could correct it.

Norm, K2NF

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: David Adams <dave@flowserver.stem.com>
Subject: [3359] Death update
Message-ID: <9601250527.AA10468@flowserver.stem.com>

(Quick note for those who have complained to me that the 520 is not a qrp rig and should not be discussed here. It is a qrp rig, I use it as such all the time. I can dip it to about 3 Watts...qrp)

So, tonight with the panic button off and some reassuring words from others I took a closer look at my rig.

I started from the very beginning. And adjusted everything according to the manual. My bias was at about 57ma, so I bumped that up to the requested 60ma.

After alignment, I looked at the numbers.
Manual calls for a plate voltage of about 200, the built in meter read roughly 240...calibration and abouts taken in this seems okay.

The Power supply HV is supposed to run about 7I read about 775, but the scale here is a bit tight. Nothing terribly odd.

So, I tried transmitting into the dummy load.

1st using the vox setting for semi break in op.

I got full power out, no sidetone and the relay kept kicking out.
I turned on the hw9 (no antenna) and tuned in. Lovely signal, nice
sound. Clean, clear, not splattering.

2nd, using the send receive switch for manual cw op. Full power,
no sidetone, but I could hold down the key as long as I want without anything
kicking out (well, eventually the tubes would blow up I spose).

Okay, transmitter is fine. Vox seems to have a prob and no sidetone...I
can hear a very faint buzz in lieu of tone though...perhaps the sidetone
amp is blown?

I look at the diagram for the AF board and find that q6 (a 2sc733) the
side tone oscillater may be the problem. The receiver seems to be in
great form, so I tend to not feel that and of the other amps are toasted
on the board. Okay, I need to test this (I could use a hand here...
any one in the sf area wanna sniff a semiconductor or two?).

Vox board, hmmm...could be the relay itself, I 'spose, don't know
how to test it though. Other points of interest are Q8 (a 2sa562) which
is the relay control and is in turn driven by 2 2sc373s. Good thing to
test (helping hand anyone?). I tried adjusting the vox sens, delay and anti
vox to see if it was a matter of something bumped, but that does not appear
to be the case.

So, I'm not paniced anymore, but i am accepting words of wisdom.

73 de dave

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: Charles Cashion <ccashion@spdmail.spd.dsccc.com>
Subject: [3368] delimna
Message-ID: <199601251353.AA12327@aplo1.spd.dsccc.com>

QRP'ers:
I have a slight problem.

One of the question and multiple choice answers in my study guide
is wrong. This bothers me, because I do not know if it matches
what I will see at an exam. If I get this Q/A on the exam, what do
I do? Give the answer I know to be correct or give the answer the
same as my study guide?

My study guide is NEW GENERAL CLASS FCC LICENSE PREPARATION 3rd
edition by Gordon West, WB6NOA. It is published by Master Publishing
of Richardson Texas and carries the Radio Shack label.

Broadly speaking, power is voltage squared divided by resistance.
RMS power is RMS voltage squared divided by resistance.
DC power is DC voltage squared divided by resistance.

Given a sine wave of voltage, the conversion to RMS is to multiply
by .707 (dot seven zero seven). So if one is given peak voltage,
then one can compute EITHER peak power or RMS power. Peak power
would be peak voltage squared divided by resistance. RMS power
would be (.707 * VP)(.707 * VP)/R.

I guess I am asking two questions. First how do I answer the question
if it appears on my exam? Second, have we re-invented the definition
of peak power, or is my publication in error or did Gordon West
just repeat what he was given by the FCC?

Thanks,
Charles
--
+ - +
| Charles Cashion w.214-519-2583 h.214-881-0952 |
| ARRL NorTex#116 NorCal#1320 ex-W5ISZ QRP-L#76 |
+ - +

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: Charles Cashion <ccashion@spdmail.spd.dsccc.com>
Subject: [3372] dilemma(2)
Message-ID: <199601251454.AA12412@aplo1.spd.dsccc.com>

Sorry guys.
I left out the pertinent data.

Here is the question from the Gordon West text

G4D03 How is the output PEP of a transmitter calculated if an
oscilloscope is used to measure the transmitter's peak load
voltage across a resistive load?
A. PEP=[(Vp)(Vp)]/(RL)
B. PEP=[(.707 PEV)(.707 PEV)]/(RL)
C. PEP=(Vp)(Vp)(RL)
D. PEP=[(1.414 PEV)(1.414 PEV)]/(RL)

Gordon says the answer is B.

Charles says the answer is A.

Just one question: What does the FCC say?

Thanks again,
Charles
--
+ - +
| Charles Cashion w.214-519-2583 h.214-881-0952 |
| ARRL NorTex#116 NorCal#1320 ex-W5ISZ QRP-L#76 |
+ - +

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: adams@chuck.dallas.sgi.com (chuck adams)
Subject: [3384] Explorer II 30M Drift
Message-ID: <199601251728.RAA02587@chuck.dallas.sgi.com>

Gang,

Larry East just posted his results of playing with
cap values in the VFO.

Last night I was going to change out the trimmer in
the VFO and first measured the drift before the change.

Here's what I get:

Start Time (minutes)	VFO Freq	Drift
00	3,626,013Hz	
01	3,625,962Hz	- 51Hz
02	3,625,930Hz	- 83Hz
03	3,625,906Hz	-107Hz
04	3,625,888Hz	-125Hz
05	3,625,878Hz	-135Hz
10	3,625,853Hz	-160Hz
15	3,625,845Hz	-168Hz
20	3,625,843Hz	-170Hz
25	3,625,844Hz	-169Hz
30	3,625,844Hz	-169Hz
60	3,625,844Hz	-169Hz

And then I quit. At this time I invoked the Chuck Adams
DFW Rule (Don't Fool With it). If it ain't broke, don't
fix it. The measurements made with cover on at room
temperature about 68F.

If you feel the drift is too much in yours, then do the following. Remove the orange trimmer cap, C62, very carefully and replace it with a 47pF COG mono cap. (ZERO tmp coeff.) This only for radios with drift values that are very much greater than say 500Hz. I find that most of the drift is within the first five minutes, so I just walk into the room turn on the rig and go across the house to get a diet coke (tm) from the frig and maybe some munchie (which are getting harder to find nowdays) and return to tear up the ether.

Now listen up boys and girls. Write this down or remember it is in the archives somewhere. You might run across a deal later in life for an Oak Hills Research Explorer II and you'll want to do this mod if it is not already there.

Explorer II Band	C62 value
40M	68pF
30M	47pF
20M	22pf

For alignment just set the VFO for the lowend setting, i.e. 0 on the big dial in front. :-) Like everything else in life you don't get something for nothing. You may be off on the high end dial reading about 2 or so KHz. To me no biggie.

This mod should reduce significantly any drift caused by the Murata variable (I think that's the manufacturer of the little orange variable) which may have a mfg spec problem from time to time. It's the 90s. Someone measure the drift under the same conditions with 10x probe on R42 as per instructions in the alignment section.

Please please use good COG monolithic caps, not just any old cap whose genetic background and history you do not know. It'll cost you more grief that it's worth.

I use the bandwidth in about the 11 to 12 o'clock position almost exclusively. It works great. I may try the above mod on the 40M version AFTER I measure it. I'll post if I get it done before next week.

My thanks to Dick at OHR for a great little rig and his support of the QRP community by providing us, the qrp-l group through John's efforts a good deal on the rigs. I got mine through the group buy and it was money well spent. The only complaint I have about the rig is that the 30M version hasn't done a thing about the propagation up there. :-) Those of you monitoring 30M please let us know when it looks like it's going to be open late in

the day. Surely with summer approaching in the northern hemisphere
we should come out of the doldrums pretty durn quick. Anyone want
to make predictions. This year? Early March?

I am not am employee of or financed by OHR. Just another satisfied
customer thereof. Once again having exceeding my allocated bandwidth.

dit dit
--
Chuck Adams (K5FO CP-60) adams@sgi.com
Box 181150, Dallas, TX 75218-8150

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: Dale Hall <102603.30@compuserve.com>
Subject: [3413] F.S. OHR CLASSIC and other things
Message-ID: <960126013444_102603.30_HHU38-1@CompuServe.COM>

I am goin to get off HF for now. So my QRP station is for sale. Prices are
"You pay all transportation charges".

OHR Classic...EC. Manual, built-in keyer, set for 7030-7130 and 14030-14130.
$175.00

Micronta 2.5 amp regulated power supply...VGC The one with the large heat sink.
$20.00

Bencher paddle. Black base model. VGC $35.00

Diamond SX200 peak reading SWR/WATT meter. Has 5/20/200 watt scales. Lighted
meter. $50.00

I am having computer problems so here is my phone if you don't hear from me 1 or
2 days after you post. 816-765-3493

de Dale KB0WZ #148 Kansas City

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: dx@sun.tir.com (Tim, WB8OGM)
Subject: [3412] FS: Gel Cells and nicad batteries
Message-ID: <31085821.8839519@news.tir.com>

12 volt gel cell batteries that have been removed from burglar alarm
systems and replaced with new ones. These batteries are like new and

have all been checked under a 2 amp load for 2 minutes by me.

I currently have on hand:

2 --- 12 volt 7ah gel cells $12ea 6" x 2.5" x 3.75"
7 --- 12 volt 6ah gel cells $10ea 6" x 2.5" x 3.75"
1 --- 12 volt 4ah gel cell $7ea 4" x 2.5" x 3.75"
0 --- 12 volt 3.2ah gel cell $5ea (temporarily sold out)
1 --- 12 volt 2ah nicad pack $4ea

WATCH FOR UPDATES EVERY FEW DAYS ON WHAT I HAVE AVAILABLE
ON THE USENET NEWSGROUP REC.RADIO.SWAP

All are guaranteed to be good and up to full charge on delivery.
All prices DO NOT include shipping charges.
When responding, include your zip code and I can tell you what
shipping charges will be.
Email me or call 810-621-9475 after 6pm if interested.
Thanks and 73...

--
Tim

 Amateur Radio: WB8OGM
 Internet Email: dx@sun.tir.com
 Packet Radio: WB8OGM@AA8GL.#nemi.mi.usa.noam

 "Sometimes imagination is better than knowledge"

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: af852@rgfn.epcc.Edu (William R Colbert)
Subject: [3405] G-QRP
Message-ID: <9601252129.AA18992@rgfn.epcc.Edu>

Someone was asking about the subscription info for G-QRP - don't
remember who it was or I would reply directly - anyway here it
is:

Mike Kilgore, KG5F
2046 Ash Will Road
Carrollton, Tx 75007 USA

Checks payable to G-QRP Club.
Renewing membership is $12 per year. I am not sure for first time

subcription/memberships - best to contact Mike first.
72/73

--
Ray Colbert, W5XE/V31XE, El Paso, Tx

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: bhopkins@polarnet.com (Bruce Hopkins)
Subject: [3393] G-QRP Address... Thanks...
Message-ID: <v01530501ad2d825f22af@[204.119.24.114]>

Thanks to all who responded to my post... Check's in the mail...

72/73/OO's - Bruce * KL7JAF
QRP-L #380 ISSB #14548
McPig #003 TFO - 359
E-Mail: bhopkins@polarnet.com
BBS: KL7JAF@KL7GNG.#NAK.AK.USA.NOAM
Snail Mail: B. Hopkins / P.O. Box 10079 / Fairbanks, AK. / 99710

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: "Brian L. Lewis" <76500.1621@compuserve.com>
Subject: [3356] Got Him - First Fox!
Message-ID: <960125035002_76500.1621_HHE68-1@CompuServe.COM>

 Just got in from teaching a Novice Theory/Code class at the local university. Turned on the rig and there he was (KK6MC at 579)!! My first FOX after 7 tries. Feels good!

 I am enjoying the QRP-L group. I am newbie to QRP and having a great time with it. Thanks!

Brian L. Lewis
N5OCD
Shreveport, La. (32.26.07n / 93.42.58w)
76500.1621@compuserve.com
24-Jan-1996 21:46:46 CST

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: af852@rgfn.epcc.Edu (William R Colbert)
Subject: [3403] GQRP-l
Message-ID: <9601252122.AA17113@rgfn.epcc.Edu>

Anyone else on this listing using the GQRP-L system? I subscribed
and got an acknowledgement back from Majordomo@blacksheep.org
welcoming to the gqrp-l, but since then nothing has arrived. Just
wondering if there is no activity or am I spoiled by the voluminous
amount of traffic here? Thanks for any insight. 72/73

--
Ray Colbert, W5XE/V31XE, El Paso, Tx

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: kreinbd@ccgate.dl.nec.com (David Kreinberg)
Subject: [3367] Heath SB-102, TNX!
Message-ID: <9600258225.AA822584472@smtpgw.ccgate.dl.nec.com>

Many thanks to all who offered help on
my Heathkit SB-102 vfo troubles.

Yes, I know this truly is a boatanchor
subjuect, but I run this pup at 5 watts
so it does qualify for this list IMHO.

Anyway, the vfo is a sealed unit - I've
not found a way to get into it (I would
love to see the innards, probably a
mechanical engineer's dream [or
nightmare ;-)].

Gess I'll break out a can opener and
cut the top off! But seriously, I think
I'll invest the $$ I otherwise would have
spent on repairing it, and build some more
antenna projects, etc.

thanks agn all.

72 de Dave KK5HA

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: vhatley@usa.pipeline.com (Vernon Hatley)
Subject: [3381] How long does it take?

How long does it usually take for the Oak Hills kits to be shipped? I ordered mine Tuesday of last week and haven't seen it yet. I'm getting a little anxious. ;-)
--
KK5RO
Vernon A. Hatley
QRP-L #325

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: TIMOTHY J PETTIBONE <tpettibo@NMSU.Edu>
Subject: [3388] Hunter Report
Message-ID: <Pine.A32.3.91.960125115235.159219D-100000@hector>

No FOX heard here last night. Did hear AA0XZ, Greg, calling Duffey but nothing else. Guess 240 miles is too close! That's 11 FOXes found out of 30 hunts (not counting the two hunts where I was the FOX).

Tim AB5OU
Las Cruces, NM

p.s. My wife still thinks I'm crazy.

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: Larry East <LVE1@inel.gov>
Subject: [3374] Improved Exporer II VFO Tracking
Message-ID: <9601251547.AA26043@garnet.inel.gov>

After (finally!) completing my Oak Hills 30M Explorer II, I followed the VFO calibration instructions and adjusted L9 and C62 for proper frequency at each end of the dial (0 and 50). However, there was very poor match between the dial reading and actual frequency at other points on the dial -- differences of several kHz at some points. I decided that the problem was due to the non-linear nature of the main tuning cap at its low capacitance end, and that it would probably be better NOT to try to get the dial and frequency to match at the high end of the dial. I decided to try aligning it between the 0 and 45 (rather than 50) dial markings. In order to do this, I had to add some capacitance in parallel with C62 -- a 68 pF NPO and a 22 pF N750 (to reduce the negative warm-up drift -- see below). After doing this, the output frequency and dial markings matched to within 1 kHz from 10.100 to 10.145 kHz -- not bad! I lost about 2 kHz at the top end (output is 10.148 kHz at a dial reading of 50), but what the heck; I never operate above about 10.120 kHz anyway.

Some other observations:

1. The VFO frequency would drift for several seconds to a few minutes each time C62 was adjusted, making it difficult to adjust. Dick at OH confirmed that this has been a problem, and said that C62 has been replaced with a fixed cap in current kits (value depends on the band).

2. I noted a VFO warmup drift of about 1 kHz (down) before adding the 22 pF N750 and 68 pF NPO caps. After adding the caps, I measured a drift of -380 Hz over the first hour (room temperature constant to within 1 degree F), -90 Hz over the next hour, and +/- 100 Hz or so over the next 18 hours (temperature fluctuated 3 or 4 degrees over the long term test period). Not bad, but indications are that a little larger N750 cap might be better. I

tried a single 100 pF N750, but that produced a large positive drift. Oh well -- back to the 22 and 68 combination.

3. The instability noted in C62 may be contributing to the drift; when I get "a round tuit" I'll try replacing it with a good quality NPO trimmer or fixed NPO cap and see what happens.

A side note: Measurements on my NorCal 40A show a warmup drift of less than 50 Hz over the first 15 minutes (typically 30 - 40 Hz), and stability to within +/- 50 Hz over a 24 hour period!

72, Larry W1HUE/7

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: dsa@apollo.hp.com
Subject: [3404] KB0VCC
Message-ID: <199601252124.QAA63410@nss2.CC.Lehigh.EDU>

Hello Everyone!

I promised several on this distribution that I'd send out my call once I knew what it was. The FCC must be catching up! I took the exams on 1/13 and today my call appeared in the database!

KB0VCC ANDERSON, DALE S LIC ISU 24-JAN-1996 TECH PLUS

It's a fist full for CW, but I'm sure HAPPY to have it!

73 de Dale, KB0VCC, QRP-L #91

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: AC6JA@aol.com
Subject: [3358] KC1 with MFJ-9420 SSB/CW RIG!
Message-ID: <960124211900_405633134@mail06.mail.aol.com>

Well, just finished building the KC1 keyer/frequency counter and incorporating it into my MFJ-9420 ssb/cw rig. Boy, am I impressed! One can put the board together in a half-hour or so, but wiring it into the rig is what takes some time. There were no specific details on how to hook up the

KC1 to the MFJ. Ended up calling Wayne Burdick, the designer of the KC1, for suggestions as to the proper vfo, audio, mute connections, etc. Hooked everything up just like he said, and now have a joyous rig indeed! Sure is nice to have a built-in keyer WITH MEMORY! Also with the touch of a button, the current frequency is sent via morse code indicating the three digits after the decimal point! Another feature is you can input the desired frequency via the paddle, then tune the vfo dial until the KC1 lets you know your on frequency! I will work on putting the recommended tap points together so that they may be included in future kit instructions. It's been awhile since I've built anything, so that's why I decided to start with something small and built the KC1.
But after building this kit, the kit-building bug has bit! I was so impressed in dealing with both Wayne at the engineering level, and Bob at Wilderness Radio at the customer-support level, that I'm going to order a NorCal 40A to keep the soldering iron afire!
Just thought I'd share my pleasant experience with the group!

If anyone's interested in the great kits that Wilderness Radio has to offer, here's their address:

Wilderness Radio
P.O. Box 734
Los Altos, CA 94023-0734

Telephone (415) 494-3806

And no, I don't have any fiduciary relationship with either of the abovementioned parties.
I had to buy my kits just like everybody else!
72's!

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: DCrespy@aol.com
Subject: [3410] Motorola Chips
Message-ID: <960125190815_127187032@mail04.mail.aol.com>

Anyone have any idea where I can get a Motorola MC3362 chip for my K9AY ??

Thanks..

Harry KG5LO

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996

From: randy foltz <rfoltz@wsunix.wsu.edu>
Subject: [3378] Nice job of fox
Message-ID: <Pine.OSF.3.91.960125081625.24749A-100000@unicorn.it.wsu.edu>

I'd like to echo Paul's, VE7CQK, comment on the fine choice of times for last night's fox, Jim. He had a very nice signal here in northern Idaho around 0220. I gave him a 579 and got a 559. Must be the 12 to 14 inches of snow we've got on the ground. Also I'd like to compliment you Jim, on your friendly, non-frantic pace of exchanges. Nice job all around.

Randy
WB5QMP ARCI #8336 QRP-L #102

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: pearl.corp@commcor.com (Steve Pearl)
Subject: [3398] No Code... [Long Message]
Message-ID: <1996Jan25.155500.1034.55151@commcor.com>

For what it's worth, here's my two dollar's-worth on the no-code issue.

First, I'm an avid reader of QRP-L because I'm working my way toward QRP operation. As such, I think it's perfectly valid to talk about the value
of no-code because CW is a completely integral part of the QRP sub-hobby. So I've enjoyed seeing the debate in amongst the discussion on antennas, FOX reports, etc.

However, it's pretty sad to watch some people take such a condescending approach to the code-requirement debate that they lose sight of the background
facts. For example, the debate on eliminating the code requirement in its entirety
started over a decade ago, about the same time as the debate on creating a code-less class of license picked up steam. To say "now they're trying to eliminate
code because of the Technician license" is just not accurate. The talk has been
going on for a long time.

I got my start in ham radio because of the no-code license. I first got interested in
amateur radio in 1980 when I started college at Drexel University. But, since

I was pretty lazy at the time, I never really went for it because I just couldn't see the
real value in CW.

(Yes, I know a lot of responses will come out of the woodwork to tell me the value
of CW... before flaming me, please read on...)

So for about 11 years, I futzed around with it, occasionally listening to code
tapes and reading up on theory, but mostly just listening on the scanner and my beautiful ICF2010 (now dearly departed to another owner). The original excuse
of not wanting to waste my time on the code gave way to the excuse "I've got a
family and just can't spend the time..."

In 1991, when it was obvious that no-code was a reality, I no longer had a convenient excuse and so I put in the effort and actually went for my license.
My wife, then pregnant with our first child, *conceded* that ham radio would be a
convenient way to get in touch with me if she went into labor and then got her
no-code ticket as well. My wife has told me on a number of occasions since then
that she is really grateful for having picked up her ticket. She has met a number of
great people and it's really helped enhance our family's communications over the
years.

Within three months of getting my ticket I became heavily involved in public service and, under the guidance and Elmering of Milt, KC3VL, I wound up coordinating the annual communications coverage for American Lung Association bike treks for the past four years. I'm now a county deputy-radio
officer for RACES and ARES. And I count a lot of that involvement to finally
finding myself right in the midst of ham-dom because of the no-code license.

I'm now an Advanced class licensee, and, due to my evangelizing, my brother,

his wife, and his in-laws are on their way to getting their General's so they can
talk back and forth on 20 between Iowa and Pennsylvania. Maybe, once they get a taste of ham radio they, too, will span out their interest and get involved in

packet, or... gasp... CW.

If it hadn't been for the no-code, none of this probably would have happened.

Why?...

.Because it's awfully tough to convince a guy who's driving a 1990-something Ford Taurus with all the goodies that he has to learn how to drive a 1950-something Nash Metropolitan *first* before he can get on the road. The 1950 Nash will get you from point A to point B and there are definitely Metropolitan fanatics out there who love it and spend a ton of money on them. But you won't have stereo, air conditioning, power steering, or a moonroof. It's a great hobby to collect antique cars, and it's a fun ride if you are into it, but it's hardly state-of-the-art transportation nor is it a necessary part of taking to the highway in 1996 when the latest thing on the road has air-bags, a hundred-watt-per-channel stereo, and, ...GASP..., a cellphone.

I like CW. I'm not going to kid anyone and say I'm a great CW op. The fact that you probably haven't heard my call on CW says something (besides the fact that I live in an antenna restricted condo). But I learned CW, and I appreciate it... for what it is... a *piece* of the overall ham hobby. Personally, I'm an evangelist for involvement in emergency communications and public service. But I would never think of requiring a person to demonstrate their ability to be a net control before I'd give them a license.

The bottom line in 1996 is that we have to show people why CW is enjoyable... not *necessary.* Truth be told, recounting stories of how a guy jury-rigged his automobile radio to transmit code when he was stranded in the wilderness gets pretty lost on folks in an age of GPS and APRS.

The answer to this debate is not complaining about the loss of the CW hurdle. The answer is coming up with ways to encourage Elmers to take new hams under their wing

to help
them experience the fullness of the hobby... and yes, getting them to enjoy CW!

There's two dollars worth and I thank you for giving it a complete reading.

73 de N3LJZ
Steve Pearl
pearl@commcor.com

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: bhopkins@polarnet.com (Bruce Hopkins)
Subject: [3365] Not a bad day in the Frozen North...
Message-ID: <v01530500ad2d07a463b4@[204.119.24.86]>

Hi Gang,

Started early this morning, considering going to bed at 3am... Just in time for grey line (not the bus)...40/80 Zip...30 Dead...Gave twenty a listen on the 80m wire, figure it to will be dead but by golly a couple signals... Crawled under the desk and switched to the tri-bander which made them considerable stronger... Nothing on .060, put out a few CQ's, no takers so went cruising... Down at the very bottom is a nice signal (1 of 3 from .000 to .060) didn't hold out much hope but gave him a call anyway... Had a nice QSO with Frank in Ceuta, Spain... Sun came up, band fell on its knees... Guess I'd better figure out the mpw on that one...

Had a sched with Warren AD5ZE at 2000z, by then the band was sounding pretty good... Never did hear Warren but gonna try again tomorrow (I guess that's really today,Thur,25 Jan.) at 2000z and 2100z... Snagged WX1B for a short QSO which put NH in the log, QRP both ways...

Sorry Chuck had good intentions of getting the 30m antenna up but it got to warm so I knew it wouldn't work right (-6f for the high today)... Did find the parts pieces so hopefully tomorrow... Also 80m wire tunes up ok on 30m but not sure what kind of signal I would have ??? Any thoughts??? Thinking of hanging a full wave loop from the tower... Have you had any experience with them ???

Spent the evening, while Lin (XYL-WL7BHT) was at her drawing group, putting my new KC-1 Keyer/Freq Counter together... Nice kit guys!!! Good quality parts, beautiful documentation, and like I hoped it took off and worked on the first try... Now when my group purchase Explorer II/20m gets here I'll be able to build it in as I build the kit... I have received counsel from Wayne on the hook up to the Explorer II so when we get it

going satisfactorily I will put a note on the group with the proper connections and part values...

You all take care... 73 from our cabin to yours...All in all, not a bad day in the Frozen North...

72/73/OO's - Bruce * KL7JAF
QRP-L #380 ISSB #14548
McPig #003 TFO - 359
E-Mail: bhopkins@polarnet.com
BBS: KL7JAF@KL7GNG.#NAK.AK.USA.NOAM
Snail Mail: B. Hopkins / P.O. Box 10079 / Fairbanks, AK. / 99710

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: "John Foote" <John_Foote_at_HDN-BCSE@ccgate.ml.nec.com>
Subject: [3385] Over the Horizon
Message-ID: <9600258226.AA822605925@mvlsmtp.ccgate.ml.nec.com>

Peter wrote:

In a message dated 96-01-22 10:42:10 EST, you write:

>Please, let's not get into the eliminate-the-code/keep-the-code debate >here in QRP-L. If you want, you can join in the fray on usenet.

SIR.... if the present trend continues, QRP on the HF bands as we know it will not be possible in a very few short years. What do you think the future of CW and a reserved band would be if CW was eliminated from HF testing. Out of the dozens of messages I have received, you are the only one who doesn't feel this topic is right for this

maillist.

Maybe it is time we, as a group, start thinking about how to handle the current situation in order to preserve our niche. Then again maybe I am just wrong.
Regards,
Peter N2KPY

I agree, Peter, especially in view of the rule change timetable outlined by ARRL Exec. Secretary Sumner W1ZZ, in the latest QST. Since it will be considered in the 1999 WARC everyone to get their stories straight this year.

I expect the CW proficiency requirement to be dropped or drastically reduced in 1999. But that doesn't automatically mean reserved spectrum for CW should disappear. Remember, many developing countries don't have ham communities rich enough to just go buy a Kenwood TS-870S. So it makes sense INTERNATIONALLY to keep areas of the major bands free of SSB to avoid degrading code operations.

And that's a separate (and stronger, I think) issue from the need, or lack of need, for "code proficency" in order to be authorized to operate on HF bands. With the onset of CW-less basic traffic and emergency calling systems, and the elimination of CW in basic MARS traffic, the logic for a code REQUIREMENT is no longer obvious.

I like an idea similar to the VHF bandplan: a separate subband for CW, half of which is a DX window, and the remainder of which is for other CW interests (including Novices). But no matter what we desire, somebody needs to emerge as the legitimate spokesperson for the HF weak signal, DX operating community.

Otherwise any proposals brought to WARC 1999 will be carried by folks without our priorities. It will be like the frequency coordinating meetings where the whole 2 meter and 440 Mhz bands are scrutinized by a room full of repeater operators -- with no ATV'ers present.

72 de KR4GL
John Foote

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: Steven Wilson <randyw@crl.com>
Subject: [3399] PIXIE 2

Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.91.960125124454.16428A-100000@crl7.crl.com>

Well I won a PIXIE 2 in a HomeBrew QRP contest. Getting ready to build it up. I normally do not build kits, but thought I would give this one a try. No name on the kit, but think it is a NorCal one. I do hv a question has anyone used a different transistor in order to boast up the power to 1 watt out ? Or has anyone tried paralleling some more 2N2222's. I am thinking of adding a couple of in parallel.

Has anyone work over 10 or 15 states with one on the home antenna ?

de stan ak0b
e-mail via randyw@crl.com

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: Buck Switzer <n8cqa@sun.tir.com>
Subject: [3409] QRP-ARCI Vote Deadline
Message-ID: <9601252353.AA17470@tir.com>

Gang - We left out one little detail! The deadline for BoD voting is 02/16/96. Which coincides with the deadline for the April QQ. Votes received after that cannot be counted, so get those ballots to Myron ASAP.

Next time (2yrs), we'll get it right.

72/73 Buck
Buck Switzer, N8CQA, 654 Georgia, Marysville, MI 48040-1243
Home: (810) 364-9640 - Fax: (810)364-8179 - Work (810)949-0151
n8cqa@tir.com - am441@detroit.freenet.org

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: Jeff Gold <JMG@tntech.edu>
Subject: [3371] RS DSP
Message-ID: <01I0F6JGZ3DE9QZZK6@tntech.edu>

I remember recently reading about RS selling their DSP for $50.. can't find it in the catalog.. also seem to remember the person doing the review didn't seem to think it was so great on CW.. I am looking for something to put on a 757GX for CW end.

73

Jeff

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: herr@ridgecrest.ca.us (Michael Herr)
Subject: [3360] Satellite challange
Message-ID: <v01530502ad2dab1069d6@[199.120.150.37]>

Gang,
 We are always looking for challanges, new area to explore, and expand our knowlege. Here is a challange I would like you to consider. QRP, homebrew satellite operation.
 I recall a long time ago, I believe pre AO-10 and perhaps pre Phase IIIA, an idea for a low cost starter mode L station. As I recall, it would have a CW transmitter and a direct conversion receiver. Minimum cost, build it your self, and have fun. I don't believe this ever went anywhere.
 Perhaps it is time that it did. Since that time QRP hams have taken the homebrewing ball and been runing with it. As a group, we started 10+ years ago building direct conversion receivers and xtal controlled transmitters. Yes, a few had before built more complex rigs but they never caught fire. We graduated to more and more complex rigs. Superhets, memory keyers, and now ssb rigs. There is increasing more and more talk of building 6 meter rigs now and many of us have wetted our satellite hamming appetite using RS12 so we know it can be done.
 With Phase IIID soon on the way and all it's attributes, a design for a easily reproducable QRP satellite rig for satellite operation could grab a group of amateurs which enjoy building, enjoy operating and enjoy experimenting.
 My thought is a direct conversion receive block, like the R1. Good to 500 MHz. Add a mixed vfo for 29 MHz and a preamp and you have a receiver for RS-10, 12 and 15. A simple VXO transmitter would suffice for a 15 meter uplink. Next, we add a vxo transmitter for 145 MHz. CW, only 3 to 5 watts output. Now we have a Mode A station. RS-10, 15 and later SEDSAT are possible. By adding a 432 vxo to the receive block we have FO-20 and it's replacement, JAS-2. By this time Phase IIID is operational. Add some no tune receive and transmit converters and we have a mode S station. In addition, we have build a 2 meter cw station which can open up another area of exploration for the QRPper!
 Are there any thoughts out
72
Mike Herr
WA6ARA
48 states QRP via RS10, RS12 es RS15

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: Ptcandy@aol.com
Subject: [3411] supervisor of communications
Message-ID: <960125195655_304167854@emout04.mail.aol.com>

Dear rog

In a message dated 96-01-23 20:43:59 EST, you write:

>move it off the list,

Seeing as you have appointed yourself the supervisor of communications to the list, I will, from now on forward to you any posting's I may have. If you feel it is appropriate, you may post it. If, on the other hand you feel my posting isn't suitable, send it back and I will correct it. I don't want to offend you.

In the meantime, try using the delete button. It works rather well and saves you the trouble of reading material you don't feel is appropriate.

Have a nice day.

Peter N 2 K P Y

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: Larry East <LVE1@inel.gov>
Subject: [3382] SWR Indicator for NorCal 40A
Message-ID: <9601251747.AA28454@garnet.inel.gov>

I've managed to shoe-horn a version of the LED SWR indicator described in the June '95 QST into my NorCal 40A. If anyone is interested in how I did it, let me know and I'll email the info. If I get more than 8 - 10 requests over the next couple of days, I'll post the info to the QRP-L list (it may also appear in the April QRP Quarterly, if there is room).

72, Larry W1HUE/7
LVE1@inel.gov

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: ddonald@vikings.onecomm.com (Dave Donaldson)
Subject: [3391] Re: Computer artwork for HB

Lars, OZ1CJX wrote

> If you have (access to) a scanner, new possibilities arise. I have
> scanned a lousy PCB-artwork from a magazine,....

I have faxed a photocopy of the airwork the exported to a graphic file that my graphic editor could use. Works will for small pcb.

Dave, WB7DRU....The state home of Rocky and Bullwinkle....Minnesota

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: Johnson_Dan@AAC.COM
Subject: [3379] Re: delimna
Message-ID: <9601251956.22763.aa@SMROUTER.AAC.COM>

Charles,

I'm sending this publicly in case I inadvertantly mislead you or it helps someone else.

Your confusion seems come from the idea that there is more than one kind of power. There isn't. Power is the amount of work that a voltage can do, whether that voltage is varying or not. Certainly, an dc voltage of 1V can do more work over time than an ac voltage that is varying between 0 and 1V.

On the other hand, given an ac voltage that is varying between 0 and 1V, there is exactly one equivalent dc voltage which could do the same amount of work as the ac voltage.

To compute the power available from an ac signal (representing a voltage that varies over time), you need to measure something about that varying ac voltage and calculate the work-equivalent dc voltage.

You can measure the peak, you can use a "true RMS" or a "fake RMS" meter, or you can use an averaging meter, but these measurements depend on the shape of the waveform and may depend on the signal's frequency. All of these measurements will give you different numbers. Whatever instrument you use, you must convert that number to the equivalent dc voltage, that

is, the dc voltage which would do the same amount of work as the ac signal that you're measuring. Only then is it OK to plug the number into the equation "P=V*V/R".

There are no such things as "RMS power" or "peak power". There is just "power", and you can compute it from an "RMS" measurement or a "peak" measurement or some other measurement, provided that you understand what you're measuring and how to convert it to the dc-equivalent voltage.

The reason your study guide used an oscilloscope is that you could see the waveform, verify that it is indeed a sine wave (or real close to it), and directly read the peak voltage. Given those conditions, multiplying the peak voltage by 0.707 gives you the work-equivalent dc voltage which you can then plug into the power equation (P=V*V/R).

The term Peak Envelope Power (PEP) means, informally, that you are taking a measurement at the time your transmitter is generating maximum output at a particular "drive", or transmit power, setting. A CW signal is unmodulated, which is to say that it's like a pure carrier signal, so its "envelope" doesn't vary (much) while you're transmitting. For SSB or AM, the signal is modulated, which means that its "envelope" varies with the audio input and typically reaches a maximum when you are speaking loud and in a high pitched voice. What the FCC wants is a measurement taken during these "PEP" conditions.

Under these "PEP" conditions, you can take a measurement - the peak voltage, "true" RMS, "fake RMS", whatever - and use the measurement to determine the dc-equivalent voltage of the signal. It is this dc-equivalent voltage that you can plug into the power equation.

Your study guide's question avoided the complications of "PEP" conditions by assuming that this condition exists at the time the measurement is taken from the oscilloscope.

Did I confuse or clarify?

72 de KC4EWT
Johnson_Dan@aac.com

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: GREGOIRE@VALLEY.NET (ERNEST GREGOIRE)
Subject: [3387] Re: delimna
Message-ID: <199601251846.NAA27844@dartvax.dartmouth.edu>

>Charles,
>

>I'm sending this publicly in case I inadvertantly mislead you or it helps
>someone else.
>
>Your confusion seems come from the idea that there is more than one kind of
>power. There isn't. Power is the amount of work that a voltage can do,
>whether that voltage is varying or not.
>Did I confuse or clarify?
>
>72 de KC4EWT
>Johnson_Dan@aac.com
>
>

Hello Gang,

This above statement is not true, voltage is just electrical pressure, it can do no work by it self. Power is the a product resulting from voltage overcoming a resistace,(impedeance), and causing current to flow.

Some power formulas: P=EI, P=I<2>R,

where power is the result in watts, E= voltage, I= current.

This is a simple power formula, and it can certainly get much more involved than this.

Look at voltage as pressure, current as water flowing in a pipe, and resistance as the size of the pipe in which x amount of water will flow at x amount of pressure in x size of pipe.

The gallons of water that would end up at the other end of the pipe is similar to watts.

Example:

100 volts x10 amps = 1000 watts.

Again this is a very simple explanation and does not take into account the many other variables in complicated circuits.

In AC, it gets much more complicated, inductive and capacitve reactance, (which are frequency dependant),
as well as resistance, and phase angle must be factored in.

None the less, it is watts that is the measure of work, not voltage.

de AA1IK N.E.-QRP-C. # 202 (Lead by example, It is better to)
QRP-L member #95. (pull a string than it is to push it.)
Ernie Gregoire
RR 1 Box 221
Canaan, NH. 03741

New England QRP Club, information
available on request by sending me a
 S.A.S.E. or via E-mail.

e-mail : GREGOIRE@VALLEY.NET
packet : AA1IK@WA1WOK.FN43FE.NH.USA

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: aa7qy@primenet.com (Roger Hightower)
Subject: [3375] Re: dilemma(2)
Message-ID: <199601251557.IAA12520@usr2.primenet.com>

At 09:55 AM 1/25/96 EST, Charles Cashion wrote:
>Sorry guys.
>I left out the pertinent data.
>
>Here is the question from the Gordon West text
>
>G4D03 How is the output PEP of a transmitter calculated if an
>oscilloscope is used to measure the transmitter's peak load
>voltage across a resistive load?
>A. PEP=[(Vp)(Vp)]/(RL)
>B. PEP=[(.707 PEV)(.707 PEV)]/(RL)
>C. PEP=(Vp)(Vp)(RL)
>D. PEP=[(1.414 PEV)(1.414 PEV)]/(RL)
>
>Gordon says the answer is B.
>
>Charles says the answer is A.
>
>Just one question: What does the FCC say?
>

Charles,

The FCC says the answer is B. See 1996 ARRL handbook, 6.7.

73, de Roger, AA7QY
Roger Hightower, AA7QY
NorCal 1099 CoQRP 176 QRP-L 62 G-QRP 9081 ARCI 8946 NE-QRP 383

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: torell@sicom.com (Kent Torell)
Subject: [3377] Re: dilemma(2)
Message-ID: <v02130501ad2d57d4fce4@[192.91.202.41]>

>G4D03 How is the output PEP of a transmitter calculated if an
>oscilloscope is used to measure the transmitter's peak load
>voltage across a resistive load?
>A. PEP=[(Vp)(Vp)]/(RL)
>B. PEP=[(.707 PEV)(.707 PEV)]/(RL)
>C. PEP=(Vp)(Vp)(RL)
>D. PEP=[(1.414 PEV)(1.414 PEV)]/(RL)
>
>Gordon says the answer is B.
>
>Charles says the answer is A.
>
>Just one question: What does the FCC say?
>
The FCC sez B.
This is to handle the case of a SSB transmitter, whose output power
fluctuates as you talk; you look at the oscilloscope, note the peak while
you talk, and then do an RMS power of that reading. For CW, you measure
the same way, but you won't notice any peaking of the envelope!

Peak to average power for voice is pretty poor; that is why there are
speech processors on some rigs, to raise the average power by compressing
the input speech waveform. Makes you sound bad, tho (IMHO). I think the
cascade sounds so good because there is a very linear audio modulator. We
qrp'rs know you don't need high average power to communicate ;-)
quality before quantity!

72, ab7oa

Kent Torell torell@sicom.com 602-483-2867 x40
SICOM 7585 E. Redfield, #202 Scottsdale, AZ 85260

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: prvalko <prvalko@Oakland.edu>
Subject: [3386] Re: FOX Report
Message-ID: <Pine.OSF.3.91.960125134124.25135B-100000@saturn.acs.oakland.edu>

On Wed, 24 Jan 1996, Norman E. Fink wrote:

> begin 666 .tar.189.FOX_Report.attach
> M'YV0:=R0*8/'A1PZ9@`H7,BPH<.'$"-*G$BQ(HB+-C*"``11(P:,#9VO!B2
<snip>

Heh heh heh. LOVE those wacky UNIX folks! :-)

73 =paul= wb8zjl

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: jeverhar@camden.ge.com
Subject: [3389] Re: FOX Report
Message-ID: <9601251910.AA07414@nashville.CAMDEN.MMC.COM>

Paul, you wrote:

>> begin 666 .tar.189.FOX_Report.attach
>> M'YV0:=R0*8/'A1PZ9@`H7,BPH<.'$"-*G$BQ(HB+-C*"``11(P:,#9VO!B2
><snip>
>
>Heh heh heh. LOVE those wacky UNIX folks! :-)
>
>73 =paul= wb8zjl

I think they oughta be ".tar.'ed" and feathered.

72/73,

Joe E., N2CX

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: earwax@indy.net (Charlie Kuhn)
Subject: [3400] Re: FOX Report
Message-ID: <199601252059.PAA02636@IndyNet.indy.net>

>
>
>Paul, you wrote:
>
>>> begin 666 .tar.189.FOX_Report.attach
>>> M'YV0:=R0*8/'A1PZ9@`H7,BPH<.'$"-*G$BQ(HB+-C*"``11(P:,#9VO!B2
>><snip>
>>
>>Heh heh heh. LOVE those wacky UNIX folks! :-)
>>
>>73 =paul= wb8zjl
>
>I think they oughta be ".tar.'ed" and feathered.
>
>72/73,
>
>Joe E., N2CX
>
>
I think they need to get a "grep" on themselves.

73 es etc...

Charlie

Charlie Kuhn, N9NVV
earwax@indy.net
Censor Yourself, Not Others
All Disclaimers Apply

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: earwax@indy.net (Charlie Kuhn)
Subject: [3401] Re: FOX Report
Message-ID: <199601252059.PAA02632@IndyNet.indy.net>

>
>

>Paul, you wrote:
>
>>> begin 666 .tar.189.FOX_Report.attach
>>> M'YV0:=R0*8/'A1PZ9@`H7,BPH<.'$"-*G$BQ(HB+-C*"``11(P:,#9VO!B2
>><snip>
>>
>>Heh heh heh. LOVE those wacky UNIX folks! :-)
>>
>>73 =paul= wb8zjl
>
>I think they oughta be ".tar.'ed" and feathered.
>
>72/73,
>
>Joe E., N2CX
>
>
I think they need to get a "grep" on themselves.

73 es etc...

Charlie

Charlie Kuhn, N9NVV
earwax@indy.net
Censor Yourself, Not Others
All Disclaimers Apply

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: David Teague <dwteague@mci.newscorp.com>
Subject: [3357] Re: Got Him - First Fox!
Message-ID: <199601250416.XAA13054@camus.delphi.com>

At 10:57 PM 1/24/96 EST, Brian L. Lewis wrote:
> Just got in from teaching a Novice Theory/Code class at the local
>university. Turned on the rig and there he was (KK6MC at 579)!! My first FOX
>after 7 tries. Feels good!

I also caught the FOX KK6MC/5. My first FOX after 3 tries!
New to QRP here also.

Sent a 569 rpt and received a 559

72/73 Dave

Dave Teague KF5IU EM31 Jena, LA QRP-L #391

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: "Jon Iza" <iapizloj@bicc00.bi.ehu.es>
Subject: [3373] Re: Marine Deep Cycle battery charging
Message-ID: <199601251605114610.iapizloj@bi.ehu.es>

Clark, and the gang,
Interesting stuff about deep cycle batteries can be found on the Web:
http://seclab.cs.ucdavis.edu/~wee/marine.seminar.html
http://nyquist.ee.ualberta.ca/~schmaus/dcbat.html

There are also some nice web pages on NiCd charging hidden among some
R/C stuff. Think about last a battery for a full weekend when the R/C
people empty'em off in a few minutes...

Be well.
jon, ea2sn

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: aa7qy@primenet.com (Roger Hightower)
Subject: [3369] RE: Maxwell's "Reflections"
Message-ID: <199601251408.HAA07211@usr3.primenet.com>

Thanks to all who responded to my question. I e-mailed ARRL Publications
and received this response. Guess I'll have to hit the used bookstores and
pay more attention at hamfests.

>Dear Mr. Hightower,
>
>Thank you for your message. Our publication Reflections, Transmission Lines
>and Antennas is no longer available. Unfortunately, this publication is out
>of print. I will send you a copy of our up-to-date catalog for your
>convenience.
>
>Sincerely,
>Zoe Belliveau
>Publication Sales
>

73, de Roger, AA7QY
Roger Hightower, AA7QY

NorCal 1099 CoQRP 176 QRP-L 62 G-QRP 9081 ARCI 8946 NE-QRP 383

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: rxd7@hunny.INS.CWRU.Edu (Richard A. Dell)
Subject: [3390] RE: No Code Tech
Message-ID: <199601251903.OAA06256@rabbit.INS.CWRU.Edu>

Greetings,

I too have fallen pray to the "No Code thread. Up front, I must say I was never in favor of creating a no code licence class. This is not because I am promoting cw, however it does serve a useful purpose in the ham ranks. I am an extra class operator and the code did not come easy for me.

I feel that the code represents a committment that each candidate for an amateur license makes as effort to show dedication to the hobby. Where on earth has anyone in this group heard of a school or college droping any part of curriculum
because the applicants found it too difficult ?? THE CODE SHOULD HAVE NEVER BEEN DROPPED IN THE FIRST PLACE !!!!

When we dropped the code we now have no code people asking to have HF priviledges without a code requirement, and as with other we only wants.....
the demands never end.

If so many no coders are sucessfully upgrading, why did they need an exemption in the first place????? For those that did upgrade I congradulate them.

As far as those members that have told other members to "take this somewhere else" , their comments are most in appropriate in several respects: as far as I know freedom of expression is still an amendment to the constitution, and CW IS
AN INTEGRAL PART OF QRP OPERATION AND THEREFORE A DISCUSSION OF ITS APPPLICATION IS PART OF THIS GROUPS DISCUSSION.

DICK, WD8ISB
Richard A. Dell
8085 Wren Drive
Macedonia, Ohio 44056

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: Pat Taber <ptaber@logicraft.com>
Subject: [3395] RE: No Code Tech
Message-ID: <199601252011.PAA90877@nss2.CC.Lehigh.EDU>

>As far as those members that have told other members to "take this
>somewhere else" , their comments are most in appropriate in several
>respects: as far as I know freedom of expression is still an amendment to
>the constitution, and CW IS
>AN INTEGRAL PART OF QRP OPERATION AND THEREFORE A DISCUSSION OF ITS
>APPPLICATION IS PART OF THIS GROUPS DISCUSSION.
>
Heaven knows I wouldn't want to violate the very Constitution of the United States (which I once swore to uphold and defend.) Your reasoned argument and those of the others here have swayed me. I withdraw my suggestion that QPR-L is not the place for the irreconcilable issues of ham radio.

More than that, I think we should start debating the US Federal budget on QRP-L as well -- because it affects the amount of discretionary income available to future generations which, if things become tight might cause more people to buy kit radios than assembled ones. And kit radios, though we know they are not homebrew, might well lead to homebrewing which is the lynchpin of QRP operation.

I have seen the light!

>>>==>PStJTT

==========
Patrick Taber Email: ptaber@logicraft.com
Principal Software Engineer Phone: (603) 880-0300
Logicraft Information Services Fax: (603) 880-7229
22 Cotton Road
Nashua N.H. 03063 Also known as: KC1TD

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: rxd7@hunny.INS.CWRU.Edu (Richard A. Dell)
Subject: [3397] RE: No Code Tech
Message-ID: <199601252044.PAA13393@rabbit.INS.CWRU.Edu>

>>>As far as those members that have told other members to "take this
>>>somewhere else" , their comments are most in appropriate in several
>>>respects: as far as I know freedom of expression is still an amendment to
>>>the constitution, and CW IS

>>>AN INTEGRAL PART OF QRP OPERATION AND THEREFORE A DISCUSSION OF ITS
>>>APPPLICATION IS PART OF THIS GROUPS DISCUSSION.
>>>
>>Heaven knows I wouldn't want to violate the very Constitution of the United
>>States (which I once swore to uphold and defend.) Your reasoned argument and
>>those of the others here have swayed me. I withdraw my suggestion that QPR-L
>>is not the place for the irreconcilable issues of ham radio.
>>
>>More than that, I think we should start debating the US Federal budget on
>>QRP-L as well -- because it affects the amount of discretionary income
>>available to future generations which, if things become tight might cause
>>more people to buy kit radios than assembled ones. And kit radios, though we
>>know they are not homebrew, might well lead to homebrewing which is the
>>lynchpin of QRP operation.
>>
>>I have seen the light!
>>
>>>>>>==>PStJTT
>>
>>==
>>Patrick Taber Email: ptaber@logicraft.com
>>Principal Software Engineer Phone: (603) 880-0300
>>Logicraft Information Services Fax: (603) 880-7229
>>22 Cotton Road
>>Nashua N.H. 03063 Also known as: KC1TD
>
>Gee Pat, I glad you see the light and retract your terse comment. I truly am
>suprised you read my "No Code Tech" comments. I thought you would just delete
>the mail since your so oppoded to this type of discussion.
>
>I admire your tongue in cheek comparison of the federal deficit to cw's
>relationship to the operation qrp rigs. oh well what could I expect!
Richard A. Dell
8085 Wren Drive
Macedonia, Ohio 44056

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: scicior@cp.uswc.uswest.com (Steve Ciciora)
Subject: [3406] RE: No Code Tech
Message-ID: <9601251946.AA06755@sp5-316.nts.uswest.com>

<snip>

> If so many no coders are sucessfully upgrading, why did they need an

> exemption in the first place????? For those that did upgrade I
> congradulate them.
>
 If it were not for the no-code licence, I still might not be a ham. In the past, I have tried to memorize code, and the question pool, but the perfectionist in me never let me feel 'ready' enough to take the test. The combination of written/code seemed overwhelming to me. It turns out, it only took me about 15 hours of reading 'Now youre talking' (and an Electrical Engineering Degree) to pass the written, and a few months later, about 20 hours with 'Super Morse' to pass my 5 WPM. Now I'm working on home brewing my own 40 meter rig so I can get my speed up to upgrade even more.
 So what is wrong with the Codeless tech? I can't find much. I'm not sure it should be extended to HF privilages, though. It really isn't that hard to learn 5WPM. 5 WPM is so slow, that you could write down the dits and dashes, and figure it out later (a bad way to learn code, I might add).

<snip>
>
> DICK, WD8ISB
> Richard A. Dell
> 8085 Wren Drive
> Macedonia, Ohio 44056
>
>
>

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: Steve.Hideg.1@nd.edu (Steve Hideg)
Subject: [3414] RE: No Code Tech
Message-ID: <v02130500ad2dac4168a3@[129.74.35.16]>

Too bad we don't have a spelling skills requirement to get an Amateur License.

72

--Steve

 Steve Hideg Macintosh Consultant/Analyst

Office of Information Technologies Telephone: (219) 631-3926
University of Notre Dame URL: http://www.nd.edu/~shideg/

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: Larry East <LVE1@inel.gov>
Subject: [3376] RE: OHR Explorer II
Message-ID: <9601251608.AA26485@garnet.inel.gov>

>Now for the bad news: I had to wear glasses to do it. To solder
>those tiny wires into those wee little holes, I had to wear reading
>glasses. To bring togather the tip of a soldering iron and the
>end of a piece of solder at the point where the wire entered the
>hole was a real test.
>Charles Cashion
>
Yep -- that's what happens when you get old! I finally had to resort to a magnifying desk lamp when building/repearing stuff...

Way back in the dark ages when I was in highschool and building radios, I had a shop teacher who said he used to build radios but gave it up when miniture tubes came out ... wonder what he would think of the stuff today?!?

72/73, Larry W1HUE/7

PS -- Good luck with the license!

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: NYOUNG@nova.wright.edu
Subject: [3407] Re: On the horizon & the future of CW
Message-ID: <01I0FOX99PR694IIE4@nova.wright.edu>

Jim Cummings is pretty close to true on about the world of radio beyond our pleasure-filled shores. One look at the station featured in a past issue of CQ magazine ought to make the point pretty quick: for some folks, ham radio is what you do after the sambar is made and the kids are finally innoculated against diseases that we sniff at here in the great Yankee Ranch of Instant Gratification. (The station, by the way, was pretty much luck and home-brew. The receiver, if I remember, was a modified modification of a modified transistor radio... probably one that had survived many a monsoon. But that's flavoring and I don't wanna take up precious time or bandwidth... as in: Am

I cutting the crap and getting to the point yet?)

If CW dies at a future WARC (as I expect it will plenty big time quick, sahib), it will die and that will be that. If the the FCC kills it as a ham radio requirement (which I expect will happen only if the ARRL and numerous moneyed organizations who want to keep ham radio in the US a rich, white-man's hobby go feet up like Gregor Samsa in his room, the rain tapping at the window... oops, sorry, don't wanna tie up too many cognitive pegs there gang... might not get right to the point, eh?

We're lucky, I guess. We get to complain about CW and about people not getting to the point. Must be because we have time to screw around with electricity. Hell, some folks ain't gonna get electricity for another three generations. Two tin cans aren't gonna end up a as a telephone with a piece of string in those situations. Nope. The tin cans will hold the manioc roots over the fire, and that's about all. So we're lucky. We can argue about CW.

I have a friend who, until he came to my house, didn't know that ham radio existed. College education, literacy in three alphabets across 6 languages and the police in front of the mosque included.

Hows this: (to the point?) Be glad you got a radio to play with.

73
Nils
WB8IJN

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: cummings.jim@ic.gc.ca (Cummings, Jim: DGRB)
Subject: [3396] RE: Over the Horizon
Message-ID: <1996Jan25.151854.1255.339438@mspost.ic.gc.ca>

From: John_Foote_at_HDN-BCSE
John wrote:

> I expect the CW proficiency requirement to be dropped or drastically reduced in 1999. But that doesn't automatically mean reserved spectrum for CW should disappear. Remember, many developing countries don't have ham communities rich enough to just go buy a Kenwood TS-870S. So it makes sense INTERNATIONALLY to keep areas of the major bands free of SSB to avoid degrading code operations.

There is no doubt that the CW requirement will go, probably at the 1999 WARC. However,
it remains to be seen what will happen at the national levels.

When I was in Senegal years ago, I recall seeing a copy of a letter from the

telecommunciations authority to an individual refusing to issue to him an amateur licence.
The reason for this refusal was based on the belief by the telecommunciations
system manager that the individual did not have the financial resources to be an amateur.

Let's be honest, most of these countries don't have the parts on hand even to build
a rig - QRP or otherwise. Usually, parts must be imported and the customs and duties
for such parts are bone crushingly heavy. Therefore, those that have the resources
will get the 870s regardless of the cost. But for the average citizen, just keep body
and soul together takes up enough of their time and resources that amateur radio
isn't even a consideration. It would be folly to think that we could project our middle
class values to cultures where a middle class hardly exists. The result is that I suspect
that QRP or CW-only building is limited to thoses who already have the resources.
Therefore, the justification to retain Morse code testing because Third World amateurs
are limited to that mode is a bit thin.

Finally, correct me if I am wrong, but I believe that the only nation the mandates
CW-only bands is indeed the United States. In the rest of the world, there are no
regulated sub-bands -- they are only reserved for particular modes by "gentlemen's
agreements". Therefore, but for the United States, incursions into the CW-only bands
by other modes is limited by the goodwill of the users of the other modes.

> And that's a separate (and stronger, I think) issue from the need, or lack of need, for "code proficency" in order to be authorized to operate on HF bands. With the onset of CW-less basic traffic and emergency calling systems, and the elimination of CW in basic MARS

> traffic, the logic for a code REQUIREMENT is no longer obvious.

I don't quite understand the logic here. Correct me please if I am wrong. John says that Morse code testing is justifiable since there are CW only sub-bands. Perhaps in the United States, that might appear true, but it doesn't apply anywhere else. Besides, when the representatives go to these WARCs, there is no considerations of the division of sub-bands because they are not address in the ITU Radio Regulations.

> I like an idea similar to the VHF bandplan: a separate subband for CW, half of which is a DX window, and the remainder of which is for other CW interests (including Novices). But no matter what we desire, somebody needs to emerge as the legitimate spokesperson for the HF weak signal, DX operating community.

But to what effect? It certainly would not have any effect upon the international
scene. It would seem to be only be a national concern.

> Otherwise any proposals brought to WARC 1999 will be carried by folks without our priorities. It will be like the frequency coordinating meetings where the whole 2 meter and 440 Mhz bands are scrutinized by a room full of repeater operators -- with no ATV'ers present.

As far as these international conferences are concerned, amateur spectrum is amateur spectrum. They are not prepared to undertake to look at the minutiae of how we decide to divide up the allocations because they don't give
a piffle -- they have much bigger fish to fry. At best, amateur radio is an annoyance
and in some administrations, it looks like it is only one step above being subversive.

> 72 de KR4GL
> John Foote

73 and live better digitally
Jim, VE3XJ

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: Felix Barreras <chonte@mailhost.nmt.edu>
Subject: [3402] Re: Over the Horizon

Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.91.960125133931.24983A-100000@black>

Hello John Foote (Juan Pata)

I have been reading the latest go-around on code vs no-code, It was good entertainment 20 years ago, and still good today, but you sir have brought out some very good reasons for keeping this alive in QRP-L. Your example of what happened in VHF/UFH repeater owners and no AT'ers is prime reason. This same subject is being tossed around in other newsgroups, and yet, there seems to be not one person to carry the torch for the rest. (perhaps you might volenteer)
And as for build vs no-build, kit or pure home-brew, 30 years ago I went through all that because I did not have money to buy off-the-shelve-ready-to-operate equipment. I still thank God there was a Heathkit Company that gave me credit and other older hams that helped along. Also I might also give credit to the US Army that made surplus equipment avilable which I converted to ham use.

On another note, I have only been able to catch the local fox and I would like to display his pelt in my shack, but no QSL yet, perhaps if he reads this, he will send me one.

73 de Felix WB5LXA QRP-L member #240

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: Frank G3YCC <frank@yorks.demon.co.uk>
Subject: [3355] Re: Re>Hw-8 to build or not to build
Message-ID: <Nx36tFAVgSBxEwX+@yorks.demon.co.uk>

In message <v01530500ad29c219d9a2@[199.120.150.82]>, Michael Herr <herr@ridgecrest.ca.us> writes
>Build the kit! Fulfil it's destiny!
>
>
>
Send it to me and fulfil mine ...
--
Frank G3YCC G QRP CLUB 042 RSGB ARCI
Packet G3YCC @ GB7HUL.#15.GBR.EU

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: WD6BOR@aol.com
Subject: [3380] Re: Source for Maxwell's book "Reflections"

Message-ID: <960125130218_126915605@emout06.mail.aol.com>

Roger,

I got my copy a couple years ago from ARRL for $20. The ARRL order number is 2995. It would be worth a call back there to see if the price is still current. It is a great book.

72,
Darrel, WD6BOR

From qrp-l@lehigh.edu Thu Jan 25 21:39:16 1996
From: Larry East <LVE1@inel.gov>
Subject: [3392] RE: SWR Indicator for NorCal 40A
Message-ID: <9601251943.AA00848@garnet.inel.gov>

Well, there seems to be plenty of interest in how I did it, so here goes:

> A recent article in QST [1] described a simple SWR indicator using LED's to indicate relative forward and reverse power. The circuit uses a fairly standard directional coupler consisting of a toroid transformer, but instead of a meter is uses a dual op-amp to drive LED indicators. This seemed like an ideal addition to my little NorCal 40A -- but where to put the toroid transformer? The output BNC connector is attached directly to the circuit board, and there is no space available between the output low-pass filter and BNC connector. Then I looked closely at the BNC connector; it's a right-angle type mounted in a plastic housing, with (very stiff) wires from the connector itself to the circuit board. It looked like a T30 toroid would fit inside the opening in the rear of the plastic housing -- provided I could straighten the wire from the center conductor of the BNC and pass it through the center of the toroid. I could, and it did! So I ended up using a T30-6 toroid with 30 turns of #30 wire in place of the T50-2 toroid specified in the article (I didn't have any T30-2's). The toroid fits nicely into the plastic housing and is held in place with Q-dope. The wire from the BNC center conductor passes through the toroid, is clipped off and a piece of wire soldered to it and passed through the original hole in the PC board.
>
> I built the remainder of the SWR circuit (TL072 dual op-amp, 78L05 voltage regulator and assorted other parts) on a small piece of "perf-board" mounted on a small right-angle bracket attached to a hole in the BNC housing with a self-tapping screw. I had to put the "null" trimmer on the transmitter side of the transformer

rather than the output side, but it works just fine. The LED's (little 3mm types, Green for FWD and Red for REV) are mounted on the front panel and connected to the perf-board with a piece of ribbon cable. I now have a self-contained SWR indicator!

The power drain due to the SWR indicator is about 4.5 mA when not transmitting; power drain when transmitting is a few mA more, depending on output power and SWR. (I selected op-amp resistors to provide 5 mA of LED current at 3W output).

[1] Tony Brock-Fisher, "Build a Super-Simple SWR Indicator," QST, June 1995 (p. 40).

Enjoy... Larry W1HUE/7